

Applicant : William J. Beyda  
Serial No. : 09/668,039  
Filed : September 21, 2000  
Page : 8 of 9

Attorney's Docket No.: 00P7906US  
Reply to Office action dated July 13, 2005

### Remarks

#### I. Status of claims

Claims 1-32 were pending.

Claim 33 has been added.

Claims 6-13 and 19-28 have been withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 1, 14, and 29 are independent claims. Claims 2-5 and 30 depend from independent claim 1. Claims 15-18 and 31 depend from independent claim 14. Claim 32 depends from independent claim 29.

#### II. Claim rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5, 14-18, and 29-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Hartrick (U.S. 5,428,529).

##### A. Independent claims 1, 14, and 29

Independent claims 1, 14, and 29 have been amended and now substantially recite that a human-readable access restriction notice in an electronic message is detected by comparing one or more characters of the human-readable access restriction notice to respective characters of one or more access restriction notices stored in memory.

During a telephone conference on August 1, 2005, the Examiner stated to Edouard Garcia that an amendment of the independent claims to include language specifying that characters in the electronic message are compared with characters stored in memory would overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Hartrick.

In view of the Examiner's statement, Applicant believes that independent claims 1, 14, and 29 now are in condition for allowance. Indeed, Hartrick's document management system does not detect a human-readable access restriction notice in an electronic message by comparing one or more characters of the human-readable access restriction notice to respective characters of one or more access restriction notices stored in memory. Instead, Hartrick's document management system searches structured documents for "special indicium tags" and manages telecommunication of soft copies of the structured documents based on detection of

Applicant : William J. Beyda  
Serial No. : 09/668,039  
Filed : September 21, 2000  
Page : 9 of 9

Attorney's Docket No.: 00P7906US  
Reply to Office action dated July 13, 2005

these special indicium tags (see, e.g., col. 5, line 63, through col. 6, line 11). The special indicium tags are used by the document management system only to set machine-readable "ON" flags in a parameter table 56, which specifies how the document management system responds to user requests to display, print, save, communicate, and render structured documents. Hartrick's document management system implements a structured document transmission policy based on the presence or absence of the special indicium flags in the "ON" column 62 of the parameter table 56 (see, e.g., col. 11, line 38, through col. 12, line 3).

For at least these reasons, the Examiner's rejection of independent claims 1, 14, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Hartrick should be withdrawn.

B. Dependent claims 2-5, 15-18, and 30-32

Claims 2-5 and 30 incorporate the features of independent claim 1, claims 15-18 and 31 incorporate the features of independent claim 14, and claim 32 incorporates the features of independent claim 29. Therefore, claims 2-5, 15-18, and 30-32 are patentable over Hartrick for at least the same reasons explained above.

III. Conclusion

For the reasons explained above, all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance and should be allowed. Please charge any excess fees or apply any credits to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Date: 13 Sept. 05

Respectfully submitted,

SIEMENS CORPORATION  
Customer Number: 28524  
Intellectual Property Department  
170 Wood Avenue South  
Iselin, New Jersey 08830  
ATTENTION: Elsa Keller, IP Department  
Telephone: (732) 321-3026

By: 

David D. Chung  
Registration No. 38,409  
Attorney for Applicants  
Tel: 650-694-5339  
Fax: 650-968-4517